

REMARKS

Rejections to Claims 1-3, 8, 15, 23, 34, 35, 39, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

AND

Rejections to Claims 4-14, 16-22, 24-33, 36-38, 40-42, and 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Examiner rejected Claims 1-3, 8, 15, 23, 34, 35, 39, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Mii (5,282,127), and further rejected Claims 4-14, 16-22, 24-33, 36-38, 40-42 and 44-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mii.

Examiner stated:

It is understood that the applicant's claimed invention monitors office machinery usage information through a foreign interface or device attached to the office machine externally. The module 10 of applicant's figure 1 is essentially claimed to be the device being attached and used to monitor the various office machinery in the system. Furthermore, these devices explicitly monitor usage management data of the office machinery and are not intended to monitor diagnostic or abnormality information like the Mii reference is characterized to only perform.

The examiner agrees that the argument presented does appear to distinguish a clear difference between the applied reference and the applicant's portrayal of their system. However, the claims are not directed toward a device attached to a office machine for reporting usage signals concerning the machine being monitored. The claims are specifically directed to remote monitoring and managing office machinery via a communication network. In order to overcome the applied reference the claims should [be] directed to an externally attached office machine device as disclosed and depicted in the specification. As presently claimed, Mii's system continues to anticipate each feature of claims 1 and 34, even usage signals are communicated back to host computer for managing or scheduling purposes.

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for discussing the scope of Applicant's claims during a telephone conference on Wednesday, February 10, 1997. In this regard, Applicant has carefully reviewed the Examiner's final conclusions concerning Applicant's claimed invention and agrees with the Examiner's understanding of the Applicant's invention. Further, Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the claims should be directed to an externally attached office machine device as disclosed and depicted in the specification, rather than remote monitoring and managing office machinery via a communications network. Accordingly, Applicant has now amended the claims to overcome the applied reference by directing the claims to an externally attached office machine device for reporting usage signals concerning the machine being monitored in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicant respectfully submits, that all of the claims, presently on file are now believed to patentably distinguish over the cited reference. In view of the above amendments and remarks presented herewith which are believed to overcome said rejections, Applicant again respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.

Respectfully submitted,
Curtis O. Kahleck
Steven D. Riedel
Thomas D. Correll
By their attorney,

14 February 1997
Date

Dwight N. Holmbo
Dwight N. Holmbo
Attorney for Applicants
Atty. Reg. No. 36,410

Mailing Address:

Dwight N. Holmbo, Sr.

RR2

Box 262A

Montgomery, MN 56069

Telephone: (612) 758-6197
(612) 758-6700